ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

Purpose of checklist:

The State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA), Chapter 43.21C RCW, requires all governmental agencies to consider the environmental impacts of a proposal before making decisions. An environmental impact statement (EIS) must be prepared for all proposals with probable significant adverse impacts on the quality of the environment. The purpose of this checklist is to provide information to help you and the agency identify impacts from your proposal (and to reduce or avoid impacts from the proposal, if it can be done) and to help the agency decide whether an EIS is required.

A. BACKGROUND

1. **Name of proposed project, if applicable:**
   North Shore Recreation Area, Sand Point Magnuson Park

2. **Name of applicant:**
   City of Seattle Department of Parks and Recreation

3. **Address and phone number of applicant and contact person:**
   City of Seattle Department of Parks and Recreation
   Sand Point Magnuson Park Division
   7400 Sand Point Way NE
   Seattle, WA 98115

   POC: Diane Hilmo
   Phone: (206) 684-7501

4. **Date checklist prepared:**
   December 18, 2001

5. **Agency requesting checklist:**
   City of Seattle Department of Parks and Recreation

6. **Proposed timing or schedule (including phasing, if applicable).**
   The City of Seattle issued a Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Sand Point Reuse Project in October 1996, which identified a future non-motorized boating center and picnic area at the north end of the Sand Point property, called the North Shore Recreation Area (NSRA). On November 1, 1999, the City of Seattle City Council approved Resolution 30063, adopting the Sand Point Magnuson Park Concept Plan, which established that the NSRA would be used for non-motorized boating and picnicking. A Master Plan was developed for the NSRA in the winter of 2000-2001.

   This proposal is to implement the NSRA Master Plan. The schedule and phasing for implementation of the plan is dependent upon funding availability and permitting requirements. Currently, there is $800,000 available from the Shoreline Parks Improvement Fund to implement the improvements at the NSRA. Construction of the proposed project is planned to begin in the fall of 2002, and would follow a phased construction process (see Item 11 for a full description of improvements):

   Phase One. The first phase of construction would include landscaping and re-vegetation of the Picnic Area and installation of the bike/pedestrian trail connecting to Sand Point Way. Replacement of temporary fencing with permanent fencing for the

boat storage area would begin during this phase, and continue throughout the other phases.

Phase Two. The second phase of construction would remove the existing over-water and in-water structures slated for removal and construct the three docks, the fast launch float, and install the deed restriction area buoys and the four (4) racing marker buoys.

Phase Three. The third phase of construction would include installation of the beach, the boat ramps, and construction of the Habitat Enhancement Area.

Phase Four. The fourth phase of construction would include installation of the remaining upland features such as lighting, vehicular turnarounds, landscaping in the existing tarmac area, completion of the permanent fencing for the boat storage area, demolition of Buildings 115/206 (the former storage and pesticide control) and 40 (the former paint shop) and parking improvements.

Any in-water construction would be conducted within the accepted timing windows as determined by the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), the US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW). Each phase is expected to take 3-6 months to complete.

7. Do you have any plans for future additions, expansion, or further activity related to or connected with this proposal? If yes, explain.

Future improvements at the NSRA would likely include upgrades to the existing buildings at the site. Building upgrades are not required for operation of the boating center and no upgrades to buildings are planned as part of this project.

8. List any environmental information you know about that has been prepared, or will be prepared, directly related to this proposal.

- *Naval Station Puget Sound, Seattle, Site Inspection Report (URS Consultants, October 7, 1993)*
- *Base Realignment and Closure Plan, NAVSTA PS, Seattle (URS Consultants, February 28, 1996)*
- *Reuse of Naval Station Puget Sound, Sand Point EIS (Dept. of the Navy, October 1997)*
- *Sand Point Reuse Project EIS (City of Seattle, October 1996)*
- *Sand Point Historic Properties Reuse and Protection Plan (EDAW, Inc., April 1998)*
- *Biological Evaluation (Anchor Environmental, September 2001)*

9. Do you know whether applications are pending for governmental approvals of other proposals directly affecting the property covered by your proposal? If yes, explain.

No other applications are pending for the NSRA.

(In the future, if funding becomes available, the buildings located in the NSRA may be renovated and the appropriate environmental review would be completed.)

10. List any governmental approvals or permits that will be needed for your proposal, if known.

City of Seattle Department of Construction and Land Use
Shoreline Substantial Development Permit
Construction Permits

State
Department of Ecology: Water Quality Certification, Coastal Zone Management Act Consistency Determination
Department of Fish and Wildlife: Hydraulic Project Approval

Federal
US Army Corps of Engineers: Section 404/10 Permits
National Marine Fisheries Services: Endangered Species Act Compliance
US Fish and Wildlife Service: Endangered Species Act Compliance

11. Give brief, complete description of your proposal, including the proposed uses and the size of the project and site. There are several questions later in this checklist that ask you to describe certain aspects of your proposal. You do not need to repeat those answers on this page. (Lead agencies may modify this form to include additional specific information on project description.)

Project Background and History

Sand Point Magnuson Park is a 320-acre park within the City of Seattle park system and is located on the western shore of Lake Washington (Figure 1). This park was recently expanded to include a 100+-acre parcel that was transferred to the City of Seattle by the US Navy following the closure of the Naval Station Puget Sound, Sand Point in 1995.

At the north tip of Sand Point Magnuson Park, the 18-acre North Shore Recreation Area (NSRA) is being converted to public recreational use. The site currently has extensive paved surfaces, sparse vegetation, and an armored shoreline (Figures 3A-3C). The project site is bordered by Lake Washington to the north, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Association (NOAA) Western Administrative Support Center to the east, the NOAA Access Road to the south, and Sand Point Way NE to the west. The site is generally flat, with a few steep slope areas, such as the slope extending from Sand Point Way NE, just west of Building 11.

The NSRA site contains many features that supported the operation of a waterfront air station (Figure 2) such as:

- *Several buildings, consisting of a former public works/shops facility (Building 11), a boathouse (Building 31), a large former aircraft hangar (Building 27), a former paint shop (Building 40), a former public works storage and pesticide control building (Building 115/206), a small storage building (Building 275), two pump stations (Buildings 98 and 116), and a floating boathouse (Building 402).*
- *Extensive paved areas (covering 78 percent of the site), bulkheads, and a seaplane ramp. (The large paved area between Buildings 11 and 27 was formerly used as an airfield tarmac; underground fuel lines in this area are still in place but no longer in use.)*

- *A pier, two floating docks and fixed boat moorage, a floating boathouse, and a log boom/wave break and dolphin.*

In 1991, the US Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Commission recommended closure of Sand Point. Several environmental studies took place over the next several years in preparation for transferring the property, including soil testing, sediment testing and other environmental health and safety investigations:

- *The extensive environmental review and cleanup at Sand Point was documented by the US Navy in the Base Realignment and Closure Cleanup Plan and Environmental Impact Statement for the Reuse of Naval Station Puget Sound, Sand Point.*
- *In October 1996, the City of Seattle issued a Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Sand Point Reuse Project that identified potential environmental effects of the proposed reuse of the Sand Point property.*
- *In June 1997, the City Council approved the Sand Point Physical Development Management Plan (PDMP), which established that the NSRA would be used for non-motorized boating.*
- *On November 1, 1999, the Seattle City Council approved Resolution 30063, adopting the Sand Point Magnuson Park Concept Plan, which refined the design for the Park including the NSRA.*
- *A Master Plan for the NSRA was developed in 2000-2001, consistent with the 1997 PDMP and the 1999 Concept Design.*

The uses identified for the NSRA in the 1996 EIS are the same as those presented in this checklist—a non-motorized boating facility and picnic area. The 1996 EIS was a programmatic review for the Sand Point Reuse area; this checklist is a project-level review of the proposed improvements at the NSRA.

Project Description

The City of Seattle Parks Department is proposing to implement several improvements at the NSRA in order to develop a non-motorized boating center and picnic area. When complete, this boating center would be the only facility of its kind on Lake Washington, and one of only a few in the Pacific Northwest.

The existing facilities at the site would be improved in order to develop a non-motorized boating center that enhances public access to the waterfront, provides opportunities for storing and renting small sailing and paddling boats, and enhances teaching opportunities. These improvements would increase public access to Lake Washington. A site plan is provided as Figure 4 and shows four primary use areas for the NSRA:

- *Non-Motorized Boating Center*
- *Picnic Area*
- *Habitat Restoration Area*
- *Multi-Use Area*

The following buildings would be removed as part of this project—Buildings 40, 115/206, 402, and a 1,250 square foot portion of Building 31. The existing picnic shelter would be relocated/reconstructed. More information on these changes is provided below.

NON-MOTORIZED BOATING CENTER

The Non-Motorized Boating Center is the main focus of the NSRA, and would provide boating enthusiasts with a rare opportunity to access Lake Washington at a location dedicated to non-motorized uses. Boat storage and hand-launching facilities are designed to meet the specific needs of kayaks, canoes, sailboards, sailboats, outrigger canoes, and similar watercraft. Specific improvements within the Boating Center are listed below.

Lake Access. *Improvements to the waterfront area would allow for efficient launching of boats (all boat launches would be conducted by hand), and would benefit the educational offerings at the site. At the end of the main pier (Pier 1), a new 'fast launch' float would replace the existing float and would allow a group of rigged sailboats to be available for use at the same time. This would be advantageous for short duration after-school classes. Three floating docks, and three boat ramps would also be constructed for boat launching:*

Facility	***Dimensions (feet)***	***Total Square Feet***
Fast Launch Float	*18 x 95*	*1,700*
Floating Dock W	*8 x 185*	*1,500*
Floating Dock M	*8 x 152*	*1,200*
Floating Dock E	*8 x 157*	*1,250*
Boat Ramp W	*28 x 85*	*2,380*
Boat Ramp M	*38 x 51*	*1,940*
Boat Ramp E	*38 x 65*	*2,470*

Amid the docks and covering the face of the existing bulkhead, a beach area would be created to serve the multitude of crafts that benefit from a beach-launch to the water, rather than accessing the water via a dock or ramp. Figure 5 presents two cross-sections from the Site Plan within this portion of the waterfront. (As the face of the bulkhead would be covered, it would no longer function as a bulkhead.)

Several existing over-water structures would be removed from the site. These structures consist of a small pier, two floats, one dolphin, a floating boathouse, and a portion of Building 31. A 130-foot section of an existing log boom at the northwest edge of the site nearest to the shoreline would also be removed. A 170-foot portion of the log boom would remain (or be replaced) to provide some protection to the fast launch float and to the covered moorage (Building 31) directly south of the boom. Most of the in-water structures that will be removed are made of creosote-treated wood material.

A maximum of 15 buoys would be placed in the water to identify the deed restriction area at the east end of the site. A maximum of four additional buoys would be installed offshore for training and racing purposes.

Vehicular access to the waterfront would be provided via the existing paved areas along the east and west sides of Building 11, with turnarounds on both sides of the building. No other public vehicular access would be provided to the

waterfront at the NSRA. Maintenance vehicles and emergency response vehicles would have access throughout the site.

Safety Boat Moorage (Building 31). *The single-story portion of Building 31, which is located over the water alongside Pier 1, would continue to house safety boats. The safety boats are the only motorized boats allowed to be housed at the facility and they are used to respond to an emergency on the water. (Some motorized boats may occasionally use moorage at Pier 1 for special events, but this use would be temporary only.) The two-story portion of Building 31 nearest the shoreline would be removed in order to enhance fish habitat along the shoreline. Building 31 is immediately adjacent to the Habitat Restoration Area (see below) and removing the 1,250 square foot portion of the building adjacent to the shoreline provides a critical element to meeting the fish habitat goals for the project.*

Boat Storage Area. *A large portion of the former airfield tarmac would be fenced and used for upland boat storage. All of the non-motorized boats that would use the NSRA facility would be transferred to the water and launched by hand. The site plan locates the storage area close to the waterfront, to minimize the distance individuals need to carry boats to the launch areas.*

Shoreline Access/Pedestrian Promenade. *The project is designed to encourage public access to the waterfront. A pedestrian promenade would be established from the entrance of the NSRA to Lake Washington along Building 11, and continuing south along the stretch of waterfront adjacent to the new docks, and back toward the main park areas. Pedestrians would also be encouraged to access Pier 1 and watch the boating activities or just enjoy the scenery. Flagpoles with banners or other integrated art would also be installed at the Boating Center.*

Parking. *The existing paved surface along the east and west sides of Building 11 would remain designated for vehicle parking. To the west of Building 11, three smaller buildings (buildings 40, 115/206) would be removed to provide additional parking spaces. The existing paved area south of the proposed boat storage area would remain designated for parking. Some of the existing paved surface near the parking areas would be removed to allow for new landscaping. A small amount of new paving would be installed for vehicle parking and turnarounds. New pavement that is accessible to motor vehicles would be equipped with storm water treatment controls to treat runoff. The new storm water treatment facilities would be connected to the existing storm water conveyance system at the NSRA.*

Figure 7 presents a conceptual illustration of the proposed improvements within the Non-Motorized Boating Center.

PICNIC AREA

The northernmost portion of the NSRA would be designated for passive recreational uses such as picnicking. In keeping with a passive use environment, the Picnic Area would include grassy areas and revegetated areas, planted primarily with grass and native species of trees and shrubs. Specific improvements within the Picnic Area are:

Revegetation. *As shown in photographs 7 and 8 in Figure 3B, the Picnic Area is generally void of any significant vegetation other than some grasses and weeds. The Parks Department is currently working to revegetate the area, and would continue this effort, using the NSRA site plan as a guide. The site plan calls for some open areas to be planted with native trees and shrubs, enhancing the habitat value of the site as well as the enjoyment of the area by visitors. Other areas would be planted in grasses or other low vegetation to allow for picnicking. Some minor grading would occur in this area to help prepare the site for planting, but the design minimizes grading and takes advantage of the natural slope of the land. Revegetation efforts within the Picnic Area would be coordinated with guidelines established in the Vegetation Management Plan for Sand Point Magnuson Park (in progress) from the Seattle Department of Parks and Recreation.*

Sand Point Way NE Connection. *Additional shoreline access would be provided in the Picnic Area via a new pedestrian/bike trail connected to Sand Point Way NE. Some grading would be required to create a paved trail with a slope that adheres to American Disability Act (ADA) standards. A 4-foot-high fence would be installed on the east side of the path on the portion of the hillside west of Building 11 for public safety. The path would lead bicyclists and pedestrians from Sand Point Way NE through the Picnic Area toward the waterfront. As shown on the Site Plan in Figure 4, there would also be an opportunity for users to connect to the southern portion of the NSRA and continue traveling on the pedestrian promenade in the Non-Motorized Boating Center area.*

Picnic Sites. *Individual and group picnicking opportunities would be available in open areas with views. The existing shelter structure, located approximately 75 feet from the shoreline, would be removed and relocated or replaced with a new covered picnic shelter of a similar size.*

HABITAT RESTORATION AREA

One of the primary improvements within this part of the NSRA is the creation of a 0.23-acre Habitat Restoration Area, which would restore the fish habitat along a 640-foot section of Lake Washington shoreline. The existing armoring, including a concrete block bulkhead, would be removed. Excavation behind the existing armoring would create an expanded area of shoreline over existing conditions. Native emergent and scrub shrub vegetation would be designated for planting along the shoreline. Figure 6 presents two cross-sections from the Site Plan in the Habitat Restoration Area.

While no boat launch facilities are provided in the Habitat Restoration Area, a small beach area would be available for non-motorized boaters (e.g. sailors, canoers, kayakers) who wish to access a picnic site via the water. There is a small building (Building 275) near the beach area that would remain unchanged on the property, and may be used as a classroom, for storage, or for shelter.

Figure 8 presents a conceptual illustration of the improvements in the Habitat Restoration Area.

MULTI-USE AREA

At the eastern end of the NSRA, the proposed improvements are limited to new landscaping and establishing new pedestrian access through the area. The large parking area to the east of Building 27 would continue to be used for a variety of different recreational uses and special events.

New Landscaping. *As shown on the Site Plan (Figure 4) a portion of the existing paving at the eastern boundary of the Multi-Use Area would be removed and planted with trees and shrubs. On the north side of the Multi-Use Area some of the paving would be removed and replaced with lawn or reinforced turf. The plantings would enhance the aesthetics of the property and would also provide a natural screen between the NSRA and the adjacent NOAA facility. If possible, some of the excavated material from the Habitat Restoration Area (see above) would be used to create a berm for plantings between the two properties.*

Shoreline Access/Pedestrian Promenade. *The pedestrian promenade in the Non-Motorized Boating Center would be connected to the Multi-Use Area, so that pedestrians can travel the entire stretch of lakefront in the NSRA.*

Construction Methods

Construction materials and equipment would be transported to the site using either trucks or barges. It is anticipated that some of the demolition and construction of in-water structures would be conducted from a barge. The barge would be outfitted with equipment (e.g. crane, pile driver) capable of removing structures and placing new materials during construction activities.

Existing over-water structures to be removed from the site consist of a small pier, two floating docks, one dolphin, a portion of the log boom, a floating boathouse and a portion of Building 31. Decking from the pier and docks would be removed prior to extracting the supporting piles. Vibratory extraction would be used to pull 44 creosote-treated piles. If the floating boathouse is not relocated offsite, it will be dismantled during the NSRA construction activities.

Prior to removing the southern portion of Building 31, asbestos abatement procedures would be followed per the requirements of the deed restriction. A silt curtain would be placed around the demolition site to contain any materials that may fall during demolition, thereby avoiding debris falling into the water. The paint on Building 31 would be tested for lead content prior to disposing of debris material. If necessary, some debris materials would be disposed of at a site suitable for hazardous waste disposal.

New over-water structures to be placed at the site consist of a fast launch float, three floating docks and three boat ramps. A total of 34 new piles would be installed to support the float and floating docks. The boat ramps would be constructed using pre-cast panels and floats. Gravel would be used to fill any gaps between panels. Some fill material (e.g., rock) would be required beneath Boat Ramp W to create the appropriate slope.

Washed gravel (1.5 inch minus) would be used to create the beach area in the Non-Motorized Boating Center. The gravel would be brought to the site and placed using

trucks. A silt-curtain would be used during gravel placement to avoid potential turbidity.

The pedestrian promenade and all new pavement would be constructed using standard construction equipment. Standard bulldozing equipment would be used for grading activities to occur in the Picnic Area. Materials for revegetation, fencing, picnic sites and the picnic shelter would be brought to the site by truck. All removed pavement would be disposed of at an approved location.

Appropriate asbestos and lead-based paint testing, removal and disposal procedures would be followed for removal of Buildings 40, 115/206.

In new paved areas accessible to motor vehicles, new storm water catch basins equipped with treatment filters would be installed. These areas would be graded before paving, and any excavated soil from these areas would be tested and disposed of in accordance with the deed restrictions for the property.

12. Location of the proposal. Give sufficient information for a person to understand the precise location of your proposed project, including a street address, if any, and section, township, and range, if known. If a proposal would occur over a range of area, provide the range or boundaries of the site(s). Provide a legal description, site plan, vicinity map, and topographic map, if reasonably available. While you should submit any plans required by the agency, you are not required to duplicate maps or detailed plans submitted with any permit applications related to this checklist.

The proposed project is located in the City of Seattle, King County, Washington, on the western shore of Lake Washington in Township 25 North, Range 04 East, Section 02 (Figure 1). The site is located within the Sand Point Magnuson Park boundaries. The street address for Sand Point Magnuson Park is 7400 Sand Point Way NE, Seattle, WA 98115.

The NSRA is bordered by Lake Washington to the north, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Association (NOAA) Western Administrative Support Center to the east, the NOAA Access Road to the south, and Sand Point Way NE to the west. The NSRA is approximately 18 acres.

B. ENVIRONMENTAL ELEMENTS

1. Earth

a. General description of the site (underline one):

Flat, rolling, hilly, steep slopes, mountainous, other:

b. What is the steepest slope on the site (approximate percent slope)?

While generally flat, the steepest slope at the NSRA is approximately 40% (at the west end of the site adjacent to Sand Point Way NE). An unpaved strip of land (approximately 10 feet by 200 feet) east of Building 11 has an approximate slope of 30%, sloping down toward the tarmac area.

c. What general types of soils are found on the site (e.g., clay, sand, gravel, peat, muck)? If you know the classification of agricultural soils, specify them and note any prime farmland.

The Sand Point peninsula is underlain by glacial till which ranges from a gravelly sandy silt to a silty sand with varied quantities of clay and scattered cobbles and boulders. The entire NSRA is on fill.

d. Are there surface indications or history of unstable soils in the immediate vicinity? If so, describe.

There was a minor landslide in 1998 on the hill immediately southwest of Building 11. No slides have been observed on the site since this time. The majority of the site is designated as a liquefaction zone.

e. Describe the purpose, type, and approximate quantities of any filling or grading proposed. Indicate source of fill.

Approximately 1,500 cubic yards of material would be used as fill for beach creation at the Lake Access area. Materials for the beach creation would be from a commercial source approved by the City of Seattle. Also, approximately 4,000 cubic yards of material would be excavated in the Habitat Restoration Area in order to create an expanded area of shoreline. Some of this material may be placed at the eastern edge of the NSRA to establish a berm for planting; or it would be transported offsite. Approximately 1.4 acres would be graded in the Picnic Area to create the paved pathway and prepare for revegetation.

f. Could erosion occur as a result of clearing, construction, or use? If so, generally describe.

Minimal clearing would be required as part of this project, as most of the site is not vegetated. Some grading would be necessary in the Picnic Area in order to establish the pedestrian/bike trail. Establishing the turnarounds and parking area in the Non-Motorized Boating Center would require removal of existing impervious surface, followed by minor grading and resurfacing. Upland excavation activities in the Habitat Restoration Area could also cause some potential for erosion. None of the grading activities at the NSRA are expected to cause significant, if any, amounts of erosion. The primary objective is to minimize grading and take advantage of the natural slope of the land and existing paved areas.

The uses of the site are expected to be low-impact. With the revegetation at the site, the amount of vegetative cover will increase over existing conditions, helping to decrease the potential for erosion. Therefore, it is anticipated that there would be minimal, if any, erosion resulting during operation of the project.

g. About what percent of the site will be covered with impervious surfaces after project construction (for example, asphalt or buildings)?

Currently, approximately 78 percent of the site (14 of 18 acres) is covered with impervious surfaces. The project would reduce the overall impervious surface by one acre.

h. Proposed measures to reduce or control erosion, or other impacts to the earth, if any:

Best Management Practices would be used to prevent erosion during construction. Native emergent and scrub shrub vegetation would be planted along the shoreline at the Habitat Restoration Area and grasses, native trees and shrubs would be planted in the Picnic Area. The expanded shoreline that would be created in the Habitat Restoration Area is also anticipated to improve shoreline stability. The project would minimize grading and take advantage of the natural slope of the land in order to maintain slope and earth stability.

2. Air

a. What types of emissions to the air would result from the proposal (i.e., dust, automobile, odors, industrial wood smoke) during construction and when the project is completed? If any, generally describe and give approximate quantities, if known.

During construction there would be emissions from construction vehicles used in the hauling and placement of materials and in hauling the fence material to the site. Most of these short-term air quality impacts would be localized and would consist of particulate matter or slight increases in carbon monoxide during the construction phase.

During operation, there would be an increase in automobile emissions at the site from the higher volumes of visitors.

b. Are there any off-site sources of emissions or odor that may affect your proposal? If so, generally describe.

There are no off-site sources of emissions or odor that would affect the proposal.

c. Proposed measures to reduce or control emissions or other impacts to air, if any:

Minimal air quality impacts are anticipated from diesel-powered equipment during construction; therefore, no measures are required to reduce or control emissions. Daily wash down of truck tires on construction equipment in upland areas would be conducted to help avoid and minimize dust-related impacts to air quality.

During operation, increased auto traffic to the site is not likely to result in significant air quality impacts. Use of the NSRA would encourage foot, bike and non-motorized boat traffic in the area, which do not result in air emissions.

3. Water

a. Surface:

(1) Is there any surface water body on or in the immediate vicinity of the site (including year-round and seasonal streams, saltwater, lakes, ponds, wetlands)? If yes, describe type and provide names. If appropriate, state what stream or river it flows into.

The NSRA is on the shore of Pontiac Bay on Lake Washington. The shoreline is approximately 1,620 feet in length, from the westernmost end

of the Habitat Restoration Area to the eastern property boundary (adjoining the NOAA property). Lake Washington is a freshwater lake.

(2) Will the project require any work over, in, or adjacent to (within 200 feet) the described water? If yes, please describe and attach available plans.

The NSRA is located on the shore of Lake Washington; therefore, much of the proposed work would occur within 200 feet of the shoreline. The proposed shoreline modifications, boat ramp and dock construction, structure removal, and the removal of a portion of Building 31 would require work to occur over and in the lake. Refer to Figure 4 for the Site Plan.

(3) Estimate the amount of fill and dredge material that would be placed in or removed from surface water or wetlands and indicate the area of the site that would be affected. Indicate the source of fill material.

Approximately 1,500 cubic yards of material would be used as fill for beach creation at the Lake Access area. Material for the beach would be provided by a commercial source, subject to approval by the City of Seattle. No dredging is anticipated, although some contouring may be necessary during construction to achieve the desired elevations in the Habitat Restoration Area.

(4) Will the proposal require surface water withdrawals or diversions? Give general description, purpose, and approximate quantities, if known.

No surface water withdrawals or diversions would be required as part of this proposal.

(5) Does the proposal lie within a 100-year floodplain? If so, note location on the site plan.

No.

(6) Does the proposal involve any discharges of waste materials to surface waters? If so, describe the type of waste and anticipated volume of discharge.

The proposal would not involve discharge of waste materials to surface waters. See Item 3a(3) for a description of fill material to be placed for the creation of the beach.

b. Ground:

(1) Will ground water be withdrawn, or will water be discharged to ground water? Give general description, purpose, and approximate quantities, if known.

No ground water would be withdrawn and no water would be discharged to ground water as part of this proposal.

(2) Describe waste material that will be discharged into the ground from septic tanks or other sources, if any (for example: domestic sewage; industrial, containing the following chemicals...; agricultural; etc.). Describe the general size of the system, the number of such systems, the number of houses to be served (if applicable), or the number of animals or humans the system(s) are expected to serve.

No waste material would be discharged.

c. Water Runoff (including storm water):

(1) Describe the source of runoff (including storm water) and method of collection and disposal, if any (include quantities, if known). Where will this water flow? Will this water flow into other waters? If so, describe.

The primary source of runoff is storm water runoff from impervious surfaces at the NSRA. An existing storm water collection system is in place at the NSRA, consisting of several catch basins and underground pipes that convey storm water to one of four outfalls to Lake Washington. These outfalls at the NSRA discharge storm water from other parts of Sand Point Magnuson Park and offsite residential areas, not just storm water from the NSRA site.

New pavement that is accessible to motor vehicles would be equipped with storm water treatment controls to treat runoff. The new storm water treatment facilities would be connected to the existing storm water conveyance system at the NSRA.

(2) Could waste materials enter ground or surface waters? If so, generally describe.

It is unlikely that waste materials would enter ground or surface waters from diesel-powered equipment at the site, although there is a chance that a minor fuel spill could occur during construction. A similar event could occur during operations from a fuel spill associated with the motorized rescue boats.

d. Proposed measures to reduce or control surface, ground, and runoff water impacts, if any:

Potential impacts to water quality related to storm water runoff would be addressed by reducing the total impervious surface area, reducing size of parking areas, and revegetating.

Implementing the proposed improvements at the NSRA would reduce the amount of impervious surface area at the 18-acre site by approximately 1 acre, thereby reducing the volume of surface water runoff at the site. The reduction in impervious area would be accomplished by removing existing paving and replacing these areas with landscaping. The proposed changes to impervious surface area are shown in Figure 9.

Within the proposed Non-Motorized Boating Center, parking would be restricted to specific areas, as compared to the current situation where parking is allowed

throughout the entire tarmac area. The designation of specific parking areas would reduce the amount of impervious surface with the potential to generate runoff that contains oil/grease deposits from automobiles. The majority of impervious surface in the Non-Motorized Boating Center would be designated for boat storage and the pedestrian/bicycle path.

Much of the Picnic Area would be revegetated, and would decrease the erosion potential and potential impacts to water quality at the site. This area of the park is currently covered with some weeds and/or dirt, and the new plantings would reduce the potential for runoff.

During construction, contractors would implement a spill prevention and response plan to avoid and minimize potential impacts to surface waters from fuel spills. During operation of the site, the Seattle Parks and Recreation Department would implement similar procedures at the NSRA that address boat maintenance and fueling processes in order to avoid and/or minimize potential impacts related to water quality. Such procedures would include locating re-fueling functions away from the water and providing the necessary spill containment features.

The project would reduce impacts related to storm water by reducing storm water runoff volumes at the site.

4. Plants

a. Check or underline types of vegetation found on the site:

_x_ deciduous tree: alder, maple, aspen, other
_x_ evergreen tree: fir, cedar, pine, other
_x_ shrubs (including knotweed)
_x_ grass
__ pasture
___ crop or grain
_x_ wet soil plants: cattail, buttercup, bulrush, skunk cabbage, other (*Iris psuedocaris* – non-native)
_x_ water plants: water lily, eelgrass, milfoil, other
___ other types of vegetation

b. What kind and amount of vegetation will be removed or altered?

Minimal clearing would be required as part of the proposed project. Vegetation that would be removed would primarily consist of weeds and grasses in the Picnic Area. This area would be re-planted as described in Section 4(d) of this checklist.

c. List threatened or endangered species known to be on or near the site.

There are no known threatened or endangered plants known to be on or near the site.

d. Proposed landscaping, use of native plants, or other measures to preserve or enhance vegetation on the site, if any:

Native emergent and scrub shrub vegetation would be designated for planting along the shoreline at the Habitat Restoration Area. Other portions of the Picnic Area would also be planted with trees, grasses and shrubs.

5. Animals

a. Circle or underline any birds and animals which have been observed on or near the site or are known to be on or near the site:

_x_ birds: hawk, heron, eagle, songbirds, other: kildares
_x_ mammals: deer, bear, elk, beaver, other: small rodents
_x_ fish: bass, salmon, trout, herring, shellfish, other:

b. List any threatened or endangered species known to be on or near the site.

The National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) has identified chinook salmon, a threatened species, and coho salmon, a candidate species, as potentially occurring in the project vicinity (NMFS 2001). The United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) has identified the coastal population of bull trout (Salvelinus confluentus), a threatened species, and bald eagles (Haliaeetus leucocephalus) as potentially occurring in the vicinity of the project area (USFWS 2001).

There are four bald eagle nesting territories located in the vicinity of the project. The closest bald eagle nesting site to the project action area is located south of Sand Point Magnuson Park, approximately 2 miles away. Wintering bald eagles may also occur in the project vicinity between October 31 and March 31.

The USFWS reports that foraging marbled murrelets (Brachyramphus marmoratus), a threatened species, "may occur in the ocean waters adjacent to the project area." However, there are no ocean waters adjacent to the project area, no marbled murrelet occupancy sites located near the project vicinity, and there is no appropriate nesting habitat in the vicinity of the project site.

c. Is the site part of a migration route? If so, explain.

Seattle lies underneath the Pacific Flyway for migrating waterfowl, so during migratory season the park, which is located on water, could conceivably contain migrating waterfowl.

At the waterfront, juvenile salmon migrate along shore en route to Puget Sound and beyond. Mature sockeye salmon may migrate along shore when returning to lakeshore spawning sites east of the park. Sockeye salmon spawning areas were identified by WDFW in 1986 along the shoreline between Matthews Beach and the south end of Sand Point Magnuson Park. One spawning site was also identified within the NSRA.

d. Proposed measures to preserve or enhance wildlife, if any:

Construction of the proposed improvements at the NSRA would result in better habitat conditions. The improvements have been designed to ensure that fish habitat is enhanced and protected, and negative impacts are avoided or minimized. These mitigation measures are summarized as follows:

- *Siting the Habitat Restoration Area adjacent to the passive use area, which maximizes the potential for providing high quality foraging and resting habitat for fish.*

- *Removing the southern portion of Building 31, daylighting this portion of the shoreline, and connecting the west and east shorelines at the site, providing an improved migratory corridor through the NSRA for juvenile salmonids.*
- *Constructing the Habitat Restoration Area would convert upland habitat to aquatic habitat by removing the existing bulkhead and pulling the shoreline back as much as 35 feet. This construction would restore fish access to the area and provide emergent aquatic and overhanging woody vegetation that is important for juvenile salmonid habitat.*
- *Providing revegetation of the shoreline in the Habitat Restoration Area would provide a source of food (terrestrial insects and aquatic invertebrates) for salmonids.*
- *Reducing the surface area of over-water structures at elevations most critical to juvenile salmon would reduce the amount of shading in the project area, thus reducing preferred bass habitat and decreasing salmonid mortality.*
- *Retaining the existing bulkhead structure east of Pier 1 to prevent potential exposure of contaminants under the tarmac from entering the aquatic environment. The exposure of contaminants could occur if the bulkhead were removed.*
- *Using small gravel in the proposed new beach area (1.5 inch minus), would be consistent with a substrate preferred by juvenile chinook for rearing and migration, as opposed to existing vertical bulkhead conditions.*
- *Observing construction windows that are protective of habitats for species listed under ESA, as established by USFWS and NMFS.*

6. Energy and Natural Resources

a. What kinds of energy (electric, natural gas, oil, wood stove, solar) will be used to meet the completed project's energy needs? Describe whether it will be used for heating, manufacturing, etc.

The NSRA is served by electric power and natural gas and the completed project would continue to use these sources to meet energy needs. The primary energy needs would be the site lighting. Site lighting would be limited to those areas accessible for evening use, such as vehicle routes to buildings and parking areas, and some pedestrian areas. The boat storage area may also use lighting at night for security reasons.

b. Would your project affect the potential use of solar energy by adjacent properties? If so, generally describe.

The project would not affect the potential use of solar energy by adjacent properties.

c. What kinds of energy conservation features are included in the plans of this proposal? List other proposed measures to reduce or control energy impacts, if any:

No additional or significant energy needs or issues are anticipated.

7. Environmental Health

a. Are there any environmental health hazards, including exposure to toxic chemicals, risk of fire and explosion, spill, or hazardous waste, that could occur as a result of this proposal? If so, describe.

As a result of past land uses and waste management practices at Sand Point, some areas were contaminated by various hazardous substances, pollutants, or wastes. Various site assessments and investigations have been conducted at Sand Point to identify this contamination. The Navy conducted cleanup activities prior to transfer of the Sand Point property to the City of Seattle. The Department of Ecology (Ecology) determined that the release of contaminants at Sand Point no longer posed a threat to human health or the environment and issued a No Further Action determination in 1996. Ecology issued a deed restriction or restrictive covenant where there is a potential for release or the contaminated soils could not be removed. These deed restrictions apply to two locations: soils beneath the tarmac east of Building 11, and a portion of sediments in eastern Pontiac Bay (Ecology 1996).

Pipelines that carried aviation fuel (avgas) throughout the NSRA while the base was operating have been cleaned and closed. Soil samples were collected at sites near the avgas pipeline to determine levels of contamination. Petroleum was detected at concentrations exceeding MTCA A cleanup levels in soil samples collected east of Building 11. The contamination does not appear to be near a source of groundwater and has been determined not to be a risk to human health or to the environment (Ecology 1996). The contaminated soil is beneath 18 to 24 inches of concrete and rebar, and in an area that is part of the former tarmac for the Naval Air Station. The contamination remains in place; however, portions of the tarmac would be removed as part of this project.

In 1992, sediment samples were collected along the shoreline and within Pontiac Bay and analyzed for contaminants. The results of the chemical analysis were inconclusive; they indicated there was no human risk associated with the sediments but there was a potential for environmental risks. Some of the compounds exceeded MTCA cleanup guidelines, particularly for PAHs and some of the metals. As a result the Navy and Ecology made the decision to perform bioassay sampling for the sediments (refer to Figure 10). It was concluded that no areas in the western portion of the site show effects at levels of concern. A No Further Action determination was given to the western half of sediments in Pontiac Bay (Ecology, 1996). However, bioassay results from a small area adjacent to the NOAA property line indicate levels of contamination that could pose environmental health concerns. Until cleanup is conducted in this area, activities that disturb sediment must be limited to prevent exposure to humans and wildlife (Department of the Navy, 1997).

(1) Describe special emergency services that might be required.

Operation of the site may result in an increased need for emergency services. Emergency rescue boats would be located at the site for on-water emergencies. The local police and fire departments and 911 services would be used for emergency response.

(2) Proposed measures to reduce or control environmental health hazards, if any:

The proposed NSRA project includes the removal of portions of the tarmac to establish landscaping and install storm water facilities. The tarmac removal would expose underlying soils. Per cleanup requirements established for the site, soil sampling would be conducted for any excavated material, and soils removed from the site would be disposed of accordingly, at an approved location.

The bulkhead shoreline along the former avgas area (east of Pier 1) would not be removed or altered so as to prevent exposing the shoreline to potential contamination. The proposed project would also not cause activities that would disturb the contaminated sediments. No new launch facilities are provided in this area and use of this area would be restricted to avoid disturbing the sediments.

Based on past remediation and sampling activities that have occurred at the NSRA and the No Further Action determination, it is assumed that the remainder of soils at the site do not present potential environmental health concerns. No additional soil contaminants would be introduced to the site as a result of the project.

During construction, contractors would follow provisions set forth by Ecology under the No Further Action letter issued by Ecology following the BRAC, dated May 16, 1996. Compliance with all other relevant and appropriate environmental regulations would be made, including WACs 173-303 (Dangerous Waste Regulations) and 296-62 (General Occupational Health Standards).

b. Noise

(1) What types of noise exist in the area that may affect your project (e.g., traffic, equipment, operation, other)?

No significant noise exists in the area that would affect the proposed project.

(2) What types and levels of noise would be created by or associated with the project on a short-term or long-term basis (e.g., traffic, construction, operation, other)? Indicate what hours noise would come from the site.

Equipment used during construction would result in minimal, short-term and localized increases in noise levels. Construction would comply with the City of Seattle Noise Ordinance.

Following construction, vehicle traffic and people would be the primary sources of noise generated at the site during operation. Occasional use of motorized rescue boats would also generate noise. All noise from the site would occur within the park hours of operation.

Residential neighborhoods are located in the vicinity of the project area, southwest of the NSRA. The nearest residence to the site is approximately 400 feet west of the south end of Building 11.

(3) Proposed measures to reduce or control noise impacts, if any:

Construction and NSRA operations would be accomplished in compliance with the City of Seattle Noise Ordinance and would not impact local noise levels.

During operation, the emphasis at the NSRA would be on non-motorized boating and passive recreation, and activities would therefore not be expected to generate high noise levels or be a source of ongoing noise for any extended period of time. The City of Seattle Parks and Recreation Department has specific policies in place for noise control at park facilities and would also develop appropriate policies for the NSRA.

8. Land and Shoreline Use

a. What is the current use of the site and adjacent properties?

The NSRA is located at the northernmost corner of Sand Point Magnuson Park and, consistent with park uses, is used for recreational purposes. Buildings 11 and 27 are used for storage, special events and as a movie studio.

Adjacent to the NSRA on the southeast side is a National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) facility that is used for research and public recreation.

The surrounding area is primarily composed of recreational, residential and some commercial uses.

b. Has the site been used for agriculture? If so, describe.

The NSRA has not been used for agriculture.

c. Describe any structures on the site.

Sand Point Magnuson Park has over 1,000,000 square feet of buildings and roads on the site. Within the NSRA there are the following buildings: Building 27 - an 115,000 square foot former hangar, Building 11 – a 59,200 square foot former public works facility, Building 31 – a 3,141 square foot boathouse, Building 40 – a 924 square foot former paint shop, Building 115/206 – a 1,500 square foot former public works storage and pesticide control building, Building 275 – a 288 square foot storage building, Buildings 98 and 116—each a 93 square foot pump station, and Building 402—a 1,760 square foot floating boathouse.

d. Will any structures be demolished? If so, what?

A 1,250 square foot portion of Building 31 adjacent to the shoreline and buildings and 115/206, would be demolished. The floating boathouse (Building 402) would be removed from the site and either demolished or relocated offsite.

e. What is the current zoning classification of the site?

The current zoning classification of the site is Residential, Single Family (SF 7200), and is also within the Sand Point Overlay District SMC 23.72

f. What is the current comprehensive plan designation of the site?

The comprehensive plan designation of the site is Public Park, Sand Point Overlay District.

g. If applicable, what is the current shoreline master program designation of the site?

The current shoreline master program designation of the site is Conservancy Recreation (CR).

h. Has any part of the site been classified as an "environmentally sensitive" area? If so, specify.

The NSRA site is characterized by Type 2 soils, which have a potential for liquefaction. Some steep slopes exist at the site. The site borders Lake Washington, a fresh water lake that provides fish habitat.

i. Approximately how many people would reside or work in the completed project?

None.

j. Approximately how many people would the completed project displace?

No people would be displaced as a result of the proposed project.

k. Proposed measures to avoid or reduce displacement impacts, if any:

No displacement impacts are anticipated.

l. Proposed measures to ensure the proposal is compatible with existing and projected land uses and plans, if any:

A Master Plan proposal, which includes extensive public involvement to ensure compatibility with existing and surrounding land uses, has been completed for the. The project is also consistent with the 1999 Sand Point Magnuson Park Master Plan and Concept Plan adopted by the City of Seattle City Council.

The City of Seattle Shoreline Master Program designation for the site (Conservancy Recreation - CR) states that: "The intent of the CR environment is to use the natural ecological system for production of food, for recreation, and to provide access by the public for recreational use of the shorelines." The proposed improvements for the NSRA are consistent with this intent.

The Sand Point Magnuson Park Design Guidelines for shoreline restoration would be followed.

9. Housing

a. Approximately how many units would be provided, if any? Indicate whether high-, middle-, or low-income housing.

No residential units would be provided at the site.

b. Approximately how many units, if any, would be eliminated? Indicate whether high-, middle-, or low-income housing.

No residential units would be eliminated.

c. Proposed measures to reduce or control housing impacts, if any:

No housing impacts are anticipated.

10. Aesthetics

a. What is the tallest height of any proposed structure(s), not including antennas: what is the principal exterior building material(s) proposed?

The new (or relocated) picnic shelter would be a maximum of 20 feet high. New lighting structures would be a maximum of 30 feet high. Flagpoles proposed at the site along the pedestrian promenade would be a maximum of 35 feet high. Currently, the tallest structure (Building 27) at the site is 50 feet high.

b. What views in the immediate vicinity would be altered or obstructed?

The proposed project would not alter or obstruct any views in the immediate vicinity.

c. Proposed measures to reduce or control aesthetic impacts, if any:

The aesthetics at the NSRA are expected to improve over existing conditions. The barren, unvegetated terrain would be greatly enhanced by revegetation and new landscaping. Many of the structures that would be removed are dilapidated and detract from the aesthetic quality of the site. All new structures would be designed to be compatible with the Sand Point Magnuson Park Design Guidelines, which include several aesthetic-related design considerations. With additional plantings, revegetation in the Picnic Area and removal of over 1 acre of impervious surfaces, the site would become less barren in appearance.

11. Light and Glare

a. What type of light or glare will the proposal produce? What time of day would it mainly occur?

The proposed project would include outdoor lighting at the boat storage area, pedestrian promenade and parking areas. Lights would be on at dark, during park operating hours. Some security lighting would remain illuminated throughout the night (dark) hours.

b. Could light or glare from the finished project be a safety hazard or interfere with views?

Lighting associated with the proposed project would not be a safety hazard. Some interference of nighttime views from neighborhoods that overlook the NSRA and Lake Washington could occur.

c. What existing off-site sources of light or glare may affect your proposal?

No existing off-site sources of light or glare would affect the proposal.

d. Proposed measures to reduce or control light and glare impacts, if any:

Only a limited portion of the NSRA would have outdoor lighting, reducing the area of potential impact. To address potential view impacts, use of lighting technologies such as cut off lights would be used. All new structures would be designed to be compatible with the Sand Point Park Design Guidelines for lighting.

12. Recreation

a. What designated and informal recreational opportunities are in the immediate vicinity?

There are several recreational opportunities in the immediate vicinity of the NSRA, including walking, picnicking, sports field, swimming, kite flying, motorized and non-motorized boating, ball fields, tennis courts, and wildlife and bird watching.

b. Would the project displace any existing recreational uses? If so, describe.

No recreational uses would be displaced as a result of the project.

c. Proposed measures to reduce or control impacts on recreation, including recreation opportunities to be provided by the project or applicant, if any:

The project proposes to provide better access to the Lake Washington shoreline for non-motorized boaters, bicyclists, and pedestrians. The NSRA project would greatly enhance the recreational features of the site by: improving public access to the shoreline; providing ADA accessible facilities along the upland portions of the site as well as at the new docks and boat ramps; and providing on-site boat storage to the public.

Once the improvements are constructed, the NSRA would be one of only a handful of non-motorized boating facilities in the Pacific Northwest. No negative recreational impacts are anticipated as a result of the proposed project.

13. Historic and Cultural Preservation

a. Are there any places or objects listed on, or proposed for, national, state, or local preservation registers known to be on or next to the site? If so, generally describe.

Sand Point is historically significant for the role it played in the US Navy's expansion and development in the Puget Sound Region, and is therefore eligible for listing on the National Register. The NSRA is within the Sand Point Historic

District (refer to Figure 11). The contributing elements of this district, which are located within the NSRA, are Buildings 11 and 31.

Building 11 was built in 1940 and has historically been used by Public Works for repair shops, office space, storage and classrooms. Building 31 is a covered wooden boathouse that was built in 1938 and has been used for boat storage and repairs, and as an office.

Two historic landscape features have been identified within the NSRA — the stepped bulkhead shoreline east of Building 31 and Pier 1 (City of Seattle, 1996).

b. Generally describe any landmarks or evidence of historic, archaeological, scientific, or cultural importance known to be on or next to the site.

Local tribal groups have raised concerns that archaeological resources may be present at Sand Point; however, no recorded archaeological sites have been found at the site (Department of the Navy, 1997).

c. Proposed measures to reduce or control impacts, if any:

The guidelines presented in the "Historic Properties Reuse and Protection Plan" (HPRP) prepared for Sand Point would continue to be followed.

The project will be reviewed by the Sand Point Magnuson Park Historic Preservation Coordinator (HPC), whose responsibilities include: (1) reviewing activities that may affect historic resources, (2) conducting historic resource consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), (3) monitoring mitigation measures, (4) coordinating historic resource training for staff, tenants, and subcontractors, and (5) coordinating interpretive efforts. The HPC would be involved in the review of this project.

A 1,250 square foot portion of Building 31 is proposed to be removed. The primary reason for removing the two-story portion of Building 31 is to support the shoreline restoration effort, which would improve fish habitat at the NSRA. The one-story portion (covered moorage) of the building would remain, helping to retain the historic significance of this resource. Buildings 115/206, and 402 would also be removed. If the removal of any of these buildings is determined to have an significant adverse effect on the historic integrity of the building or the District, consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) would be initiated. If necessary, mitigation for the impact to this historic property would be provided through the terms of a mitigation agreement to be negotiated by the HPC and SHPO, consistent with the ownership deed covenant.

No other contributing elements to the historic nature of the site would be impacted by the project. Buildings 11 and 27 would not be modified or altered as part of this proposal, and no changes would be made to the areas immediately surrounding the land-based buildings at the NSRA.

During construction, if any evidence of an archaeological nature is observed, work would stop immediately and the proper resource agencies and tribes would be contacted to observe and assess the archaeological evidence before re-convening construction activities.

14. Transportation

a. Describe below public streets and highways serving the site, and describe proposed access to the existing street system. Show on site plans, if any.

The main entrance into the NSRA is through the Sand Point Magnuson Park (and former naval station main gate) 74th Street entrance, then north along 63rd Avenue NE and NE 77th Street through the underpass under the NOAA Access Road (see Figure 4). Sand Point Way NE is designated as a principal arterial south of NE 65th Street. It generally serves north-south traffic following the Lake Washington shoreline along the City of Seattle's eastern boundary from NE 45th Street just east of the University of Washington to NE 125th Street near Lake City.

b. Is site currently served by public transit? If not, what is the approximate distance to the nearest transit stop?

King County Metro Transit Route 75 has a bus stop at the Park entrance on Sand Point Way NE adjacent to the site.

c. How many parking spaces would the completed project have? How many would the project eliminate?

Approximately 120 parking spaces would be provided for the Boating Center by re-striping a specific area of the existing tarmac. An additional eight parking spaces for disabled visitors would be designated around the perimeter of Building 11.

Currently, parking is allowed throughout paved areas in the NSRA site, although only a portion of the area is striped for parking. The project would restrict parking to designated areas. The total area available for parking would be reduced by approximately 70,000 square feet, an area that could provide approximately 300 parking spaces.

The paved area east of Building 27 provides up to 300 parking spaces – no changes to parking spaces are proposed in this location.

d. Will the proposal require any new roads or streets, or improvements to existing roads or streets, not including driveways? If so, generally describe (indicate whether public or private).

The site would use existing roads to access the site.

e. Will the project use (or occur in the immediate vicinity of) water, rail, or air transportation? If so, generally describe.

The site may be accessed via water using personal non-motorized boating crafts.

f. How many vehicular trips per day would be generated by the completed project? If known, indicate when peak volumes would occur.

A transportation analysis was prepared in 1996 for the Sand Point Reuse Project EIS, which estimated that approximately 548 daily trips would be generated from operation of the NSRA (Buildings 11 and 31). Most of these trips would not occur

during peak hour traffic, with approximately 46 trips that would occur during the PM Peak Hour (City of Seattle, 1996).

g. Proposed measures to reduce or control transportation impacts, if any:

No significant transportation impacts are anticipated. The project is designed (e.g. on-site boat storage) to encourage carpools, transit use, walking, and bicycling, and thus decrease the potential number of vehicle trips impacting the arterial streets. Although the total area available for parking would be reduced, the amount of designated parking spaces at the NSRA would be adequate to support the proposed uses.

The proposed project is consistent with the Sand Point Magnuson Park Design Guidelines for access and circulation.

15. Public Services

a. Would the project result in an increased need for public services (for example: fire protection, police protection, health care, schools, other)? If so, generally describe.

With the additional park users generated by the NSRA, there may be an increase in the need for public services such as fire and police protection; however, this increase is expected to be minimal. The Seattle Police Department and Seattle Fire Department would provide police and fire protection services.

b. Proposed measures to reduce or control direct impacts on public services, if any.

Safety boats would be located at the site and safety precautions used to help prevent the need for emergency services. Security personnel would continue to monitor Sand Point Magnuson Park.

16. Utilities

a. Underline utilities currently available at the site:

City operated utilities currently provided at the site are electricity, water, and sanitary sewer. Telephone service, cable TV, and natural gas are provided by private utilities.

b. Describe the utilities that are proposed for the project, the utility providing the service, and the general construction activities on the site or in the immediate vicinity which might be needed.

No additional utilities would be required by this proposal.

C. SIGNATURE

The above answers are true and complete to the best of my knowledge. I understand that the lead agency is relying on them to make its decision.

Signature: (signed by Ann Costanza)

Title: Environmental Planner

Date Submitted: 1/14/02

Reviewed by: (signed by Peter S. Marshall)

Title: Sr. Park Planner Division Planning and Development, Seattle Parks and Recreation Department

Date: 1/16/02